

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 7-8, and 12-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Petros et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,806,838). In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 4-6 and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petros in view of Zafar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,064,721). These rejections are respectfully traversed. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 7-8, and 12-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,806,838 to Petros, et al. (“Petros”). However, Petros fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of Applicant’s claims. Therefore the foregoing Section 102 rejections should be withdrawn.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites, in relevant part:

A stationary terrestrial/satellite antenna and receiver system for reception of AM, FM, satellite and terrestrial rebroadcast satellite signals, comprising:

a stationary integrated head unit positioned on the surface including an AM/FM terrestrial receiver/tuner human interface and a satellite receiver/tuner human interface, wherein the terrestrial antenna is connected to the AM/FM terrestrial receiver/tuner human interface and the satellite antenna is connected to the satellite receiver/tuner human interface via a conduit.

(emphasis added). Contrary to the Examiner’s assertion (Office Action, page 2, second paragraph), “a stationary integrated head unit positioned on the surface including an AM/FM terrestrial

receiver/tuner human interface and a satellite receiver/tuner human interface” (emphasis added), as required by claim 1, is not taught or suggested by Petros. Indeed, the portion of Petros cited by the Examiner indicates that the *system as a whole*, as opposed to the *head unit*, includes an

SDARS receiver (SDARS/RX) 314, SDARS audio cable 330, and combined head unit and AM/FM tuner. Combined head unit and AM/FM tuner 328 is comprised of AM/FM tuner 324, and head unit 320.

(*Column 3, lines 55-58*). Figure 3 of Petros clearly illustrates the SDARS/RX satellite receiver (labeled as element 314) located remotely from the Combined Head Unit and AM/FM Tuner (labeled as element 328), wherein the Combined Head Unit and AM/FM Tuner includes “Head Unit” 320 and “AM/FM Tuner” 324.

Moreover, in the office action (page 3, second paragraph), the Examiner suggests that Petros does not “clearly (show) that satellite receiver and radio receiver (are) integrated (in) head unit (328 of figure 8).” To the contrary, element 328 in Figure 8, which is described as “combined head unit AM/FM tuner 328” (*Column 8, lines 55, 56*) and is indicated by the dotted line labeled “328,” clearly encircles “AM/FM tuner” 324 and “Head Unit” 320. The dotted line indicating element 328 does not encircle a satellite receiver. In other words, the SDARS/RX satellite receiver, clearly marked as “SDARS/RX” and labeled as element 314, is shown remote from element 328. Thus, Petros cannot possibly teach or suggest a stationary head unit including a satellite receiver/tuner human interface, as required by independent claim 1. For at least this reason, independent claim 1, and dependent claims 2-3, 7-8, and 12-18, are patentable over the cited art and in condition for allowance.

Claim 12

Claim 12 is directed to a stationary terrestrial/satellite antenna and receiver system according to claim 1, wherein the low noise amplifier circuit includes,

a satellite low noise amplifier with a first input connected to a first end of a satellite output, wherein the output of the low noise amplifier is the SDARS/SAT/TER cable.

(*emphasis added*). Petros discloses a combined satellite terrestrial antenna system having a first low noise amplifier (LNA) SAT/LNA that outputs to a SDARS/SAT cable 312 and a second low noise amplifier TER/LNA 710 that outputs to SDARS/TER cable 316. (*Column 8, lines 26 – 28. See also FIG. 7*). However, Petros does not disclose a satellite low noise amplifier wherein the output of the low noise amplifier is the SDARS/SAT/TER cable, as required by claim 12.

In finally rejecting claim 12, the Examiner focused solely on the first part of the cited element, “a first input connected to a first end of a satellite output,” and summarily rejected Applicant’s arguments presented in response to the non-final office action. (*Office Action, page 3, third and fourth paragraphs*). Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has mischaracterized Applicant’s argument by stating that “applicant argued that [in] dependent claim 12, Petros does not teach a satellite low noise amplifier with a first input connected to a first end of a satellite output.” (*Office Action, page 3, third paragraph*). To the contrary, Applicant’s response, repeated herein, was that that Petros does not teach a satellite low noise amplifier wherein the output of the low noise amplifier is the SDARS/SAT/TER cable.

In addition to the foregoing, claim 12 is independently patentable for at least another reason. Applicants' claim 12 discloses the system of claim 1 wherein the low noise amplifier circuit comprises a satellite low noise amplifier with a first input connected to a first end of a satellite output, wherein the output of the low noise amplifier is the SDARS/SAT/TER cable.

In contrast, Petros teaches that "the output of SAT/LNA 704 is SDARS/SAT cable 312 and the output of TER/LNA 710 is SDARS/TER cable 316." (Petros, Col. 8, lines 26 – 28; See also Petros, Col. 7, lines 59-316). Thus, the output of the low noise amplifier in Petros is either a SDARS/SAT cable 312 or a SDARS/TER cable 316. In either event, Petros does not teach or suggest a satellite low noise amplifier with a first input connected to a first end of a satellite output, wherein the output of the low noise amplifier is the SDARS/SAT/TER cable, as required by claim 12.

(Office Action response, 01/23/2007, Page 10, third paragraph). As stated in the preceding paragraph, Petros does not teach or suggest an LNA having as an output a SDARS/SAT/TER cable. For at least this reason, the rejection of claim 12 as allegedly anticipated by Petros should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 4-6 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Petros in view of Zafar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,064,721). As set forth above, Petros does not disclose all of the limitations as required by independent claim 1. The addition of Zafar does not cure these deficiencies. Therefore, for at least this reason, claims 4-6 and 9-11, which depend from independent claim 1, are also in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. 65899-0702 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw. To the extent necessary, a petition for extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made, the fee for which should be charged to such deposit account number.

Dated: May 30, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Shelly L. Hokenstad/

Shelly L. Hokenstad

Registration No.: 59,107

William J. Halford

Registration No.: L0331

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

Correspondence Customer Number: 10291

Attorney for Applicant